

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11-19, and 26-29 of the present application are pending. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14-16, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Pat. No. 6,511,035, issued to Teel et al. (hereinafter Teel), and claims 21-25 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Pat. No. 6,220,100, issued to Felkins et al. (hereinafter Felkins). In addition, claims 3 and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Teel in view of United States Pat. No. 5,170,104, issued to Laughlin (hereinafter Laughlin), claims 7, 17, and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Teel in view of United States Pat. No. 6,241,435, issued to Huang et al. (hereinafter Huang). The Applicants have cancelled claim 14 and amended claims 1, 11-13, 15, 17, and 26. Further, the Applicants have amended the specification. For the reasons set forth below the Applicants respectfully submit that all the claims pending in the present application are in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15-16, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Teel. For a reference to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the reference must teach every element of the claimed invention. (See MPEP §2131). Claim 1 of the present application is directed to a platform assembly that supports a vibration-sensitive payload configured to be supported by one or more legs and includes a platform having a first surface coupled to a vibration-sensitive payload, a second surface, and an inner core located between and coupled to the first and second surfaces, and at least one vibration sensor located within said inner core and configured to sense a vibration of a surface of the platform.

Teel is directed to an active vibration isolation system. More specifically, Figure 2 of Teel shows a table assembly 10 having a platform 12 supported by a plurality of legs 14. Teel further states that “[t]he table assembly 10 may include one or more vibration isolators 30 mounted in to the table legs 14.” (See Col. 3, l. 16-35). In addition, Teel includes sensors 52 positioned within the table legs 14. (See Col. 3, l.59-63). In contrast, claim 1 of the present application includes at least one vibration sensor located within the inner core of the platform. Further, unlike Teel, the device recited in claim 1 of the present application may be used with or without legs or other support mechanisms coupled thereto while retaining its vibration-sensing capabilities. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that Teel fails to teach every element of the device of claim 1 in accordance with MPEP §2131. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Teel. Further, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 4-6, 8, and 9 which variously depend from claim 1, are similarly allowable over Teel.

For at least the reasons stated above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11, 12, 15-16, 18, and 19 are allowable over Teel. More specifically, the Applicants respectfully submit that Teel fails to teach or suggest a platform having a first surface coupled to the vibration-sensitive payload, a second surface, and an inner core located between and coupled to the first and second surfaces, at least one vibration sensor positioned within the inner core and coupled to at least one of the first surface and the second surface, a damper positioned within the inner core and coupled to at least one of the first surface and the second surface, and a control circuit in communication with the vibration sensor and the damper. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that Teel fails to teach every element of the device of claim 11 in accordance with MPEP §2131.

Claims 3 and 13 of the present application stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Teel in view of Laughlin. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met by the Examiner. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or to combine the teaching of the references. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. (See MPEP §2143.03). As discussed above, Teel fails to teach or suggest a platform having a platform assembly that supports a vibration-sensitive payload and includes a platform having a first surface coupled to a vibration-sensitive payload, a second surface, and an inner core located between and coupled to the first and second surfaces, and at least one vibration sensor located within said inner core and configured to sense a vibration of a surface of the platform. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that neither Teel nor Laughlin, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 3 and 13 in accordance with MPEP §2143.03.

Claims 7 and 17 of the present application stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Teel in view of Huang. Huang is directed to a universal adaptive machining chatter control fixture. Like Teel, Huang fails to teach or suggest a platform having a first surface and a second surface and an inner core positioned therebetween and coupled thereto, the inner core having at least one vibration sensor positioned therein. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that neither Teel nor Huang, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests all the limitations of claims 7 and 17 of the present application in accordance with MPEP §2143.03.

Further, the Applicants respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to provide a motivation to modify or combine the teaches of Teel with the teaching of Laughlin or Huang in order to make the rejection to claims 3, 7, 13, and 17 as required by MPEP §2143.03. Rather, the

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has used impermissible hindsight to recreate the Applicant's invention.

If the Examiner feels for any reason that direct contact with Applicant's attorney will advance the prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number given below.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is in form for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, including petition fees and extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-3411 (Docket No. 155603-0311).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 26, 2006

By: Brian F. Swienton
Brian F. Swienton,
Reg. No. 49,030

Newport Corporation
1791 Newport Center Drive
Irvine, CA 91711